



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/267,781	03/15/1999	DENNY M. LIN	36J.P191	7568
5514	7590	12/16/2003		
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				
			EXAMINER WHIPKEY, JASON T	
			ART UNIT 2612	PAPER NUMBER 17

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/267,781

Applicant(s)

LIN, DENNY M.

Examiner

Jason T. Whipkey

Art Unit

2612

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See attached detailed advisory action.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.Claim(s) objected to: None.Claim(s) rejected: 2-5 and 7-10.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

8. ☒ The drawing correction filed on 04 November 2003 is a) ☒ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

ADVISORY ACTION

1. The period for reply ran for FOUR MONTHS from the date of the final rejection. Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) accompanied by the appropriate fee. The date on which the petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. A reply within the meaning of 37 C.F.R. § 1.113 or a request for a continued examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 must be timely filed to avoid abandonment of this application.

2. Applicant's arguments filed November 4, 2003, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the rejection of claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 10, Applicant argues:

In Doran, scan line pixel data from a scanner is received by a splitter and divided into four channels (30-1 to 30-4) and overlap data (T, B) is added to the beginning and end of each channel of pixel data.... However, Doran is not seen to disclose the use of the use of [sic] *charge or voltage duplicating circuitry that obtains multiple outputs for each pixel in the overlap region, and that provides each of the multiple outputs to individual ones of the output pipelines that border on the overlap region.* Instead, Doran is simply seen to add predetermined number of pixels to each divided segment of data before the data segment is sent to a corresponding channel for parallel processing.

Page 4, line 22, through page 5, line 7. The examiner agrees with Applicant's analysis of Doran but maintains that this analysis anticipates Applicant's independent claims.

Art Unit: 2612

In reference to Figure 3, for example, the examiner maintains that charge or voltage duplicating circuitry is inherently present because (a) image data is inherently represented by charges/voltages, and (b) image data from channel 1 is included in both channel 1 and the "T" section of channel 2, while image data from channel 2 is included in both channel 2 and the "B" section of channel 1. Therefore, the *charges or voltages used to represent the image data must be duplicated in order for the same image data to appear in the outputs of channels 1 and 2*. See also column 10, lines 5-18.

For this reason, the rejection stands.


3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason T. Whipkey, whose telephone number is (703) 305-1819. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. eastern standard time, alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy R. Garber, can be reached on (703) 305-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office, whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

JTW
JTW

December 1, 2003


WENDY R. GARBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600